

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 13, 17, 18, 22, 24-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,158) in view of Armstrong et al. ("WebWatcher: A Learning Apprentice for the World Wide Web," 1995); rejected claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Pant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,053); rejected claims 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Page (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,999); rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Lazarus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,532); rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,838); and rejected claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirsch et al.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 24-26, 28, and 31 to improve form and add new claim 37. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with regard to the pending claims. Claims 1-34 and 37 are pending.

In paragraph 5-1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 13, 17, 18, 22, 24-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1, for example, is directed to a computer-implemented method for modifying documents to aid a user in determining which entry of one or more entries in the documents to choose. The method comprises identifying a preexisting document stored by a server in a network, where the identified document includes one or more entries; determining a

score for each of the entries in the identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry; modifying the identified document based on the determined scores; and providing the modified document.

Neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 1. For example, neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests determining a score for each of the entries in the identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses this feature and cited col. 5, lines 38-42, of Kirsch et al. for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kirsch et al. is directed to performing parallel searches of multiple indexes to produce multiple preliminary or partial search reports and merging the search reports into a final report (col. 9, lines 6-48). Kirsch et al. discloses determining relevancy scores for the documents listed in the search reports based on the number of occurrences of terms in the documents (col. 9, lines 25-35).

At col. 5, lines 38-42, Kirsch et al. discloses:

A directed N-way intersection of the preliminary search reports is performed to produce a search report with unique document identifications. The search scores of intersected documents from the preliminary reports are summed to yield an aggregate relevancy score for each of the documents.

In this section, Kirsch et al. discloses that the relevancy scores for documents appearing in multiple search reports is summed to yield aggregate relevancy scores. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Kirsch et al. disclose or remotely suggest determining a score for each of the entries in an identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry, as

required by claim 1.

Armstrong et al. discloses a WebWatcher that has learned knowledge of how to search outward from a page on which it was invoked and uses this knowledge to suggest a hyperlink that the user should take to get to a page that satisfies the user's search (page 3, left column, first full paragraph; page 3, right column, fourth full paragraph). Armstrong et al. discloses highlighting the link that is most promising (page 3, left column, second full paragraph). Nowhere does Armstrong et al. disclose or suggest, however, determining a score for each of the entries in an identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry, as required by claim 1. Instead, Armstrong et al. discloses determining the probability that following a hyperlink on a page leads along the shortest path to a page that satisfies the user's request (page 3, right column, fourth full paragraph).

The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to modify Kirsch et al. to include "modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by [Armstrong et al.], providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information" (Office Action, page 3). Applicants disagree.

Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. are directed to completely different systems with completely different purposes. For example, Kirsch et al. is directed to performing parallel searches of multiple indexes to produce multiple preliminary or partial search reports and merging the search reports into a final report (col. 9, lines 6-48). Armstrong et al., on the other hand, is directed to a WebWatcher that recommends links to users to assist the users in arriving at their desired information (Section 2). One of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the

disclosure of Kirsch et al. would not have been motivated to combine that disclosure with the disclosure of Armstrong et al. absent impermissible hindsight.

Nevertheless, because neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests determining a score for each of the entries in an identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry, even if it would have been obvious to combine the disclosures of Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al., the combined system would not determine a score for each of the entries in an identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry, as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 2, 4-6, 11, 13, 17, 18, and 22 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1. Claims 2, 4-6, 11, 13, 17, 18, and 22 are also patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. for reasons of their own.

For example, claim 11 recites receiving a query from the user, determining a score for each of the linked documents using the received query, and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document. Neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 11.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses the features of claim 11 (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree. Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest, for example, associating determined scores for linked documents with corresponding entries in an identified preexisting document stored by a server in a network, as required by claim 11.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses this feature and cited col. 13, lines 38-

40. Applicants respectfully disagree.

At col. 13, lines 36-44, Kirsch et al. discloses:

The result merger unit 50 then operates on the term lists to perform an N-way merge and relational join 118 to form a single term list. The N-way merge creates a list of unique document IDs and their corresponding relevancy scores. Where multiple search engines identify common documents that contain multiple different search terms, a unique instance of the document ID is maintained with a cumulative value of the relevancy scores.

In this section, Kirsch et al. discloses that an N-way merge operation is performed to create a list of unique document IDs and corresponding relevancy scores. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Kirsch et al. disclose or suggest associating determined scores for linked documents with corresponding entries in an identified preexisting document stored by a server in a network, as required by claim 11. The list created the N-way merge in Kirsch et al. cannot reasonably be equated to a preexisting document stored by a server in a network. Armstrong et al. also does not disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al.

Claim 13 recites receiving input from the user, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the received input, and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document. Neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 13.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses the features of claim 13 (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree. Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest, for example, associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in an identified preexisting document stored by a server in a network, as required by claim

13.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses this feature and cited col. 13, lines 38-40. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Col. 13, lines 36-44, of Kirsch et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Kirsch et al. discloses that an N-way merge operation is performed to create a list of unique document IDs and corresponding relevancy scores. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Kirsch et al. disclose or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in an identified preexisting document stored by a server in a network, as required by claim 13. The list created the N-way merge in Kirsch et al. cannot reasonably be equated to a preexisting document stored by a server in a network. Armstrong et al. also does not disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al.

Amended independent claims 24-26, 28, and 31 recite features similar to, but different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claims 24-26, 28, and 31 are, therefore, patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28 and are, therefore, patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 28.

Independent claim 27 is directed to a web browser stored in a computer-readable medium. The web browser comprises instructions for requesting documents stored on at least one server based on addresses associated with the documents, each of the documents including

one or more entries; instructions for determining scores for each of the entries; instructions for modifying the requested documents based on the determined scores; and instructions for presenting the modified documents to facilitate selection of one or more of the entries.

Neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 27. For example, neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests a web browser that includes, among other things, instructions for determining scores for each of the entries, instructions for modifying the requested documents based on the determined scores, and instructions for presenting the modified documents to facilitate selection of one or more of the entries.

The Examiner alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses determining scores and Armstrong et al. discloses modifying the requested documents and presenting the modified documents (Office Action, pages 7-8). Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Kirsch et al. disclose or remotely suggest a web browser that includes instructions for determining scores for each of the entries, as required by claim 27. Instead, Kirsch et al. discloses operations performed by a search site 16 (col. 5, line 24 - col. 6, line 2), not operations performed by a web browser, as required by claim 27.

In addition, nowhere does Armstrong et al. disclose or remotely suggest a web browser that includes instructions for modifying the requested documents based on the determined scores, and instructions for presenting the modified documents to facilitate selection of one or more of the entries, as required by claim 27. Instead, Armstrong et al. discloses operations performed by a WebWatcher on a server (Section 2), not operations performed by a web browser, as required by claim 27.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 33 is directed to a computer-implemented method for modifying a document by a first server in a network that includes the first server and at least one second server. The method comprises receiving a document from the second server, the document including one or more entries; determining a score for a number of the one or more entries; modifying the document based on the determined scores; and sending the modified document to the second server.

Neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 33. For example, neither Kirsch et al. nor Armstrong et al. discloses or suggests sending the modified document to a second server from which the document is received.

The Examiner admitted that Kirsch et al. does not disclose this feature of claim 33, but alleged that Armstrong et al. discloses the feature and cited page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs, of Armstrong et al. for support (Office Action, page 10). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs, Armstrong et al. discloses that the WebWatcher notes the URL of the page from which a user invoked the WebWatcher, receives information from the user, replaces each URL on the page with a new URL that points to the WebWatcher, highlights any of the hyperlinks on the page that are strongly recommended by its search control knowledge, and sends the modified copy of the page to the user. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Armstrong et al. disclose or suggest sending the modified document



to a second server from which the document is received, as required by claim 33.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentable over Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

In paragraph 6-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Pant et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20, and 23 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of Pant et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20, and 23 are patentable over Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Pant et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

In paragraph 6-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Page. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 7 recites for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that contain links to the linked document, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents, and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document.

The Examiner admitted that Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. do not disclose the features of claim 7, but alleged that Page discloses the features (Office Action, pages 13-14). The

Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious "to modify Kirsch in view of [Armstrong et al.] to include provide for scoring linked database documents as taught by Page, providing the motivation to determine the importance of a document" (Office Action, page 14). Applicants submit that the Examiner's motivation statement lacks merit.

The motivation statement is merely a conclusory statement providing an alleged benefit of the combination. No portion of any of the references is pointed to as providing objective motivation for combining Page with the disclosure of Kirsch et al. or Armstrong et al. It is apparent that the Examiner's approach to the ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 amounts to a retrospective assessment as to how the claimed invention works and then combining unrelated references in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. This type of reverse engineering approach to the obviousness issue under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been repeatedly judicially condemned. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.; Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co. Absent such hindsight reasoning, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

The disclosure of Kirsch et al. is directed to performing parallel searches of multiple indexes to produce multiple preliminary or partial search reports and merging the search reports into a final report, where relevancy scores are determined for documents in the search reports based on a number of occurrences of a term in the documents and the relevancy scores are summed for documents appearing in multiple search reports (col. 9, lines 6-48). Armstrong et al., on the other hand, is directed to a WebWatcher that determines a probability for a link on a page that following the link leads to a shortest path to a page that satisfies the user's goal (page 3, right column, fourth full paragraph). Page discloses a link-based approach for ranking

documents (col. 2, lines 39-50). One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to replace the scoring technique of Kirsch et al. or the probability determination of Armstrong et al. with the link-based approach of Page absent impermissible hindsight reasoning. The Examiner has not provided any objective motivation for combining the disclosures of Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Page. Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 7.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Page, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

The rejection of claims 9 and 10 are similarly deficient for reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 7. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are patentable over Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Page, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 7.

In paragraph 6-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Lazarus et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 8 recites determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates, and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document.

The Examiner admitted that Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. do not disclose or suggest, for example, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates (Office Action, page 15). The Examiner alleged that Lazarus et al. discloses

this feature and cited col. 26, lines 15-55, of Lazarus et al. for support (Office Action, page 15).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

At col. 26, lines 15-55, Lazarus et al. discloses:

If the user requests a web page to read 218, the user profile vector is modified by the content vector of the requested web page.

The updated profile vector is then used as the basis for selecting relevant ads to display to the user. Relevance is determined by closeness of the user profile vector to entity vectors stored in the ad vector database. The closest entity vector is selected as being most relevant.

If the user is presented an ad, and the user requests more information of the subject of the ad by clicking on the ad, both the current ad entity vector and the profile vector are updated. The user profile vector is moved or adapted a small step in the direction of the entity vector. The entity vector is moved or adapted a small step in the direction of the profile vector of the person who clicked on the ad. Thus, the system allows ads to assume the characteristics of the users that purchase them in a real-time adaptive manner.

#### Discovery and Analysis Mode

During discovery and analysis mode, at periodic intervals, the system administrator performs relationship discovery and analysis of the contents of both the entity vector database 230 and the user profile vector database 226 to discover useful and exploitable characteristics of user behavior. The RDA module 236 performs vector clustering, reporting and provides summary statistical information of system effectiveness in terms of user clickthrough rate. The behavior clusters discovered during analysis serves as the basis of advertising campaigns and provides valuable insight into user behavioral preferences. The behavior clusters can be utilized as the initial conditions for entity vectors the advertiser wants to target by group, rather than on an individual basis.

The system shown in FIG. 2 has two sets of adaptive components. First are the user profile vectors. Second are the content vectors for each of the advertisements. Both sets of vectors influence each other based upon the actions of the users. Ads are updated in such a manner as to adapt toward regions of high user interest, thus improving system effectiveness and automatically discovering group preferences. User profile vectors adapt based on the observed actions of the user, thus providing an accurate and timely representation of user preferences both individually and as a group.

In this section, Lazarus et al. discloses a technique for selecting ads to display to a user based on a closeness of a user profile vector to entity vectors stored in a database. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Lazarus et al. disclose or remotely suggest determining a score for each of the

linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates, as required by claim 8.

The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to "modify Kirsch in view of [Armstrong et al.] to include determining clickthrough rate as taught by [Lazarus], providing the benefit of selecting and presenting personally targeted entities such as advertising, ... based on observed user behavior . . . for practical and financial reasons" (Office Action, pages 15-16). Applicants submit that the Examiner's motivation statement lacks merit.

The motivation statement is merely a conclusory statement providing an alleged benefit of the combination. No portion of any of the references is pointed to as providing objective motivation for combining Lazarus et al. with the disclosure of Kirsch et al. or Armstrong et al. It is apparent that the Examiner's approach to the ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 amounts to a retrospective assessment as to how the claimed invention works and then combining unrelated references in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. This type of reverse engineering approach to the obviousness issue under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been repeatedly judicially condemned. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.; Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co. Absent such hindsight reasoning, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Kirsch et al. is directed to performing parallel searches of multiple indexes to produce multiple preliminary or partial search reports and merging the search reports into a final report, where relevancy scores are determined for documents in the search reports based on a number of occurrences of a term in the documents and the relevancy scores are summed for documents appearing in multiple search reports (col. 9, lines 6-48). Armstrong et al., on the other hand, is directed to a WebWatcher that determines a probability for a link on a page that following the

link leads to a shortest path to a page that satisfies the user's goal (page 3, right column, fourth full paragraph). Lazarus et al. is directed to presenting targeted advertisements to a user based on observed user behavior (Abstract). One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to replace the scoring technique of Kirsch et al. or the probability determination of Armstrong et al. with the targeted advertising of Lazarus et al. absent impermissible hindsight reasoning. The Examiner has not provided any objective motivation for combining the disclosures of Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Lazarus et al. Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 8.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Lazarus et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

In paragraph 6-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. in view of Armstrong et al. and Brown et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 19 and 21 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of Brown et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Kirsch et al. and Armstrong et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that claims 19 and 21 are patentable over Kirsch et al., Armstrong et al., and Brown et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

In paragraph 6-6, the Examiner rejected claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kirsch et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 32 is directed to a first server in a network including the first server and a plurality of second servers. The first server comprises a memory configured to store

instructions; and a processor configured to execute the instructions in the memory to obtain, from one of the second servers, one or more entries from a document, determine scores for the one or more entries, and return the scores to the one second server.

Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 32. For example, Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest a processor to obtain, from one of the second servers, one or more entries from a document, determine scores for the one or more entries, and return the scores to the one second server.

The Examiner did not specifically address the features of claim 32, but alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses a document server attached to multiple database servers distributed within a search site and a skilled artisan would consider these distributed servers as equivalent to the second server recited in claim 32 to determine scores for entries from a predetermined document from a collection of documents (Office Action, page 17). Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Examiner's allegation is valid (a point that Applicants do not concede), Kirsch et al. does not disclose a first server that obtains, from one of the distributed servers of Kirsch et al. (which the Examiner alleged was equivalent to the second servers), one or more entries from a document, determines scores for the one or more entries, and returns the scores to the one distributed server, as would be required by claim 32.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over Kirsch et al.

Independent claim 34 is directed to a first server in a network that includes the first server and at least one second server. The first server comprises a memory configured to store instructions; and a processor configured to execute the instructions in the memory to obtain a document that includes one or more entries from the second server, determine a score for a

number of the one or more entries, modify the one or more entries based on the determined scores, and send the document with the modified one or more entries to the second server.

Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 34.

For example, Kirsch et al. does not disclose or suggest a processor to obtain a document that includes one or more entries from the second server, determine a score for a number of the one or more entries, modify the one or more entries based on the determined scores, and send the document with the modified one or more entries to the second server.

The Examiner did not specifically address the features of claim 34, but alleged that Kirsch et al. discloses a document server attached to multiple database servers distributed within a search site and a skilled artisan would consider these distributed servers as equivalent to the second server recited in claim 34 to determine scores for entries from a predetermined document from a collection of documents (Office Action, page 17). Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Examiner's allegation is valid (a point that Applicants do not concede), Kirsch et al. does not disclose a first server that obtains a document that includes one or more entries from the distributed server, determines a score for a number of the one or more entries, modifies the one or more entries based on the determined scores, and sends the document with the modified one or more entries to the distributed server, as would be required by claim 34.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 34 is patentable over Kirsch et al.

New independent claim 37 is directed to a client device. The client device comprises a browser to receive an input from a user, request a document based on the input, the document including a plurality of links to other documents; and a browser assistant to intercept the document, parse the document to identify the links in the document, determine a score for each



of the links, modify the document based on the determined scores, and present the modified document to the user.

None of the references cited by the Examiner, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses the combination of features recited in claim 37. For example, none of the references discloses a browser assistant located on a client device that intercepts a document requested by a browser on the client device, parses the document to identify the links in the document, determines a score for each of the links, modifies the document based on the determined scores, and presents the modified document to the user.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to discuss any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 35 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:   
Paul A. Harrity  
Reg. No. 39,574

Date: January 3, 2006

11350 RANDOM HILLS ROAD  
SUITE 600  
FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22030  
TELEPHONE: 571-432-0800  
FACSIMILE: 571-432-0808